

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 25 were examined in the Non-Final Office Action mailed on 11/13/2008 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13-16, 18, 20-21 and 25 are sought to be 5 amended. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 25 are presented for consideration, further in view of below remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 10 were objected to stating that in the limitation "keeping track of a set of rollback procedures," it was unclear if the term "said set of procedures" refers to the "set of task procedures" or the "set of rollback procedures." Claims 1, 10 and 16 are accordingly amended to replace the term "said set of procedures" with the term "said set of rollback procedures". Withdrawal of the objection with respect to claims 1 and 10 is respectfully 15 requested.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 10, and 16, the Examiner had pointed out that there should be an "and" between the last wherein clause and the whereby clause. Claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 are accordingly sought to be amended.

Further, the claims 1, 7, 10, and 16, were objected to stating that the limitation 20 "whereby each user program can have corresponding custom logic" was indefinite because it was unclear whether or not the "user program" actually had "corresponding custom logic." Claims 1, 7, 10, 16 are accordingly amended to replace the term "can have" with the term "has". It is believed that the amendments make the claims definite and withdrawal of the objections with respect to claims 1, 7, 10, and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 7, 10, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It was stated that the claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification, specifically, the limitation "corresponding custom logic for the corresponding pair of task procedure and rollback procedure" does not appear in the specification.

5 The Examiner had noted that "The specification discusses "custom atomic transactions," see e.g. the Abstract, and "custom rollback procedures," see par. 20, but not "corresponding custom logic for the corresponding pair of task procedure and rollback procedure."'" (lines 7-10, page 3 of the Outstanding Office Action).

10 Claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 are sought to be accordingly amended to recite "... corresponding custom logic specified by a user for ~~the corresponding pair of task procedure and each of the rollback procedures.~~" Support for the amended language is found, for example, in paragraph 0020 of the subject specification, as pointed out by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

15 Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, stating that the claim term "computer readable medium" may include carrier waves.

Claims 7-10, 13-15 and 25 are accordingly amended to replace the term "computer readable medium" with the term "computer readable storage medium".

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

20

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 16-17, 20-21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gostanian *et al*, U.S. 5,781,910, in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, Fig. 1 and specification paragraphs 22-33 ("AAPA").

25 Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's assertions, Applicants submit that the presented claims are allowable over the art of record.

For example, the Examiner concedes that Gostanian does not teach or reasonably suggest the claimed feature of "keeping track of a set of rollback procedures...", and instead relies on AAPA.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the rollback procedures are kept track of external to the user program and in response to executing the corresponding task procedures. In sharp contrast, the AAPA relied upon by the Examiner relate to user programs and the programmer (of the user program) has the burden of keeping track of the task procedures, and thus claim 1 is allowable over the combined teachings of Gostanian and AAPA.

In addition, currently amended claim 1 recites that the transaction identifier is generated by a transaction manager and the transaction identifier is thereafter included in each of the combinations (in the user program) further containing a task procedure and a corresponding rollback procedure. As explained below, the transaction identifier is not available in user program in either Gostanian or AAPA.

The Examiner relies on Figure 5 and associated description of Gostanian for teaching the transaction identifier and then relies on AAPA for teaching the claimed combinations. The Examiner further concedes that Gostanian does not teach the claimed combinations. See page 5 line 20 through page 6 line 15 of the Outstanding Office Action.

The transaction identifier of Gostanian is clearly not made available to the user programs. See, for example, Figure 5 of Gostanian, which shows request 510 being received from application client (AC) arguably akin to the claimed user program, and reply (to client) 574 being again sent to AC. There is no teaching or suggestion in Gostanian that reply 574 contains the transaction identifier.

AAPA does not cure that deficiency at least as evidenced by the absence of corresponding code in Figure 1 of the subject application.

The Examiner asserts that the word 'Account1()' of Figure 1 is the atomic transaction identifier. Such an analogy is erroneous and/or unreasonable in that the label 'Account1()'

is not generated in the transaction manager (rather it is integral to the user program).

At least for one of the reasons noted above, currently amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above
5 with respect to claim 1.

Currently amended claim 5 is independently allowable in reciting that the aborting of the atomic transaction is specified in the user program using an instruction containing **the transaction identifier**.

Currently amended independent claim 7 is allowable over the art of record at least for
10 some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1 in reciting that “...wherein said transaction manager generates a unique value as said identifier and ***provides said identifier to said user program***; setting ***a variable to equal said identifier in said user program***; specifying a plurality of combinations in said user program for execution in said system, wherein ***each of said plurality of combinations contains said variable***, a task procedure, and
15 a rollback procedure,...aborting said atomic transaction ***by specifying, in said user program, said identifier associated with an abort procedure*** to cause said rollback procedures to be executed,...” (***Emphasis Added***).

Claims 8-9 and 25 depend from claim 7 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 7.

20 Currently amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1 in reciting that “...***providing said identifier to said user program; receiving*** a plurality of combinations for execution ***from said user program***, wherein ***each of said plurality of combinations contains said transaction identifier***, a task procedure, and a rollback procedure, ...***said abort request being received from said user program and containing said identifier,...***” (***Emphasis Added***).
25

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

5 Currently amended independent claim 16 is allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 16.

Conclusion

10 Thus, it is believed that all objections and rejections have been overcome and continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416

Date: February 11, 2009